

### I. Claim 56 is not anticipated by Peeters

Independent Claim 56 has been rejected by the Examiner as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The Applicant respectfully submits that this previously rejected claim is allowable over the Peeters reference cited by the Examiner. In order for Peeters to anticipate claim 56, each claimed element must be disclosed in the same. The claims to the present invention clearly point out novel features of the invention not taught by Peeters.

Peeters teaches an array of electrodes at the atomic or nano scale built on a chip. The nanoelectrode arrays are “constructed on a doped semiconductor substrate by nanolithography using scanning probes.” Col. 10, lns. 32-34. In other words, the nanoelectrodes taught by Peeters are built on the surface using an electric field. The resulting nanoelectrodes are then utilized to mimic molecular binding sites.

Independent claim 56 is not anticipated by Peeters because Peeters does not disclose a molecular deposition domain, which is deposited on the surface. See claim 56 (“an at least one molecular deposition domain deposited on said surface”). As described above, Peeters discloses nanoelectrodes that are built on a surface utilizing an STM. See Col. 4, lns. 16-17; Col. 4, 27-45. Electrodes built on a surface are different than the molecular deposition domains as claimed. Peeters only discloses structures that mimic a molecular domain but are not themselves a molecular domain. The claims of the present invention are to an array of domains that do not mimic a chemical binding site, but are, in fact, the actual chemical binding site deposited on the surface.

The prior art cited by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest the present invention.

II. Dependent claims 57-65 Are Allowable

Because dependent claims 57-65 depend on independent claim 56 either directly or indirectly, the arguments presented above apply *a fortiori* to these claims. As such, each of the dependent claims are patentable over Peeters.

**CONCLUSION**

For all of the above reasons, it is believed that all of the present claims are now in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/31/2001

By Scott A. Marks

Scott A. Marks, Esq. (Reg. No. 44,902)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Pillsbury Center South

220 South Sixth Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Telephone: (612) 752-7314

Attorneys for Applicants